

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-19 are hereby amended editorially. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-19 are pending.

The title of the invention has been objected to. The title has been amended to SAFETY CONNECTION INTENDED FOR SUSPENDING OBJECTS. The arrangement of the specification is objected to because of the lack of headings and for various informalities. The specification has been amended to add headings where appropriate and to amend page 4, line 1. A Marked-up copy and clean copy are enclosed. No new matter has been added. Removal of the objection is requested.

Claims 1, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 18 are objected to for various informalities. Claims 1, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15 and 18 have been amended. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

**Claim rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Franklin (US 3,540,089). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a safety connection intended for suspending objects. The safety connection comprises at least one first and one second retaining element. The first retaining element, after mounting, is coupled to the object to be suspended, while the second retaining element, after mounting, is connected to an environment. The second retaining element also comprises at least one resilient lip. The first and second retaining

elements are arranged to cooperate via the resilient lip for effecting the detachable coupling of the retaining elements.

Franklin teaches a self-releasing animal tether. It is clear the device taught by Franklin is not intended for suspending objects. Element C is a collar which is to be worn around the neck of a dog A. Franklin fails to teach or suggest the first retaining element is coupled to the object to be suspended after mounting, while the second retaining element is connected to an environment after mounting. Thus, Franklin fails to anticipate claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-16, 18 and 19 depend from claim 1. For the reasons discussed above for claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


Claims 1, 2, 5-7 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bradley (US 5,957,612). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Bradley teaches a plastic rubber ring (110), Fig. 7, for effecting the detachable coupling of the retaining elements which is similar to the ring (72) shown in Fig. 5 and ring (51) shown in Figs. 2 and 3. A disadvantage of this safety connection is that the value of the threshold load is variable within a relatively large range of forces, pg. 2, ll. 4-6. Bradley fails to teach or suggest the second retaining element also comprises at least one resilient lip, the first and second retaining elements are arranged to cooperate via the resilient lip for effecting the detachable coupling of the retaining elements. Thus, Bradley fails to anticipate claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 5-7 and 14-19 depend from claim 1. For the reasons discussed above for claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

App. No. 10/620550  
Office Action Dated October 20, 2004  
Amd. Dated February 22, 2005

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicants' primary attorney-of record, John J. Gresens (Reg. No. 33,112), at (612) 371.5265.




Dated: February 22, 2005

JJG:mmm

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

By   
John J. Gresens  
Reg. No. 33,112